



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/558,152	11/23/2005	Masafumi Hirata	0033-1042PUS1	1878
2292 7590 08/12/2011 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				
EXAMINER SCOTT, RANDY A				
ART UNIT 2453		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 08/12/2011		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

**Application No.**

10/558,152

**Applicant(s)**

HIRATA ET AL.

**Examiner**

RANDY SCOTT

**Art Unit**

2453

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 19 July 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(g).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_  
Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/R. S./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2453

/Philip C Lee/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2453

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to the applicant's argument that Abileah does not provide any disclosure as to a connector obtaining unit responsive to an application management unit:

The cited prior art reference, Abileah, does not specifically use the term "obtaining" in regards to utilizing connectors, but does provide several references in regards to creating, building, and using connectors for various functions using a common application metamodel for interoperability with existing applications (see par [0078], lines 1-7 of Abileah). In this instance, the common application metamodel responsive to required interactive functions with application systems. The application-domain interface metamodel of par [0078] of Abileah would be considered synonymous with the applicant's claimed application management unit because the application metamodel defines parameters and specifications for the application system that requires the connectors. In regards to using an "existing" connector, par [0080] of Abileah provides plenty of references to function calls for preexisting connectors.

In response to the applicant's argument that Gibbons et al fail to teach an application managing unit that analyzes application data to determine an existing connector that specifies information indicating a function required for executing said application:

Col. 16, lines 59-67 of Gibbons discloses a configuration descriptor file that specifies application data to be managed by a configuration manager, functionality required by the application, and capability matching based on functionality. In this instance, the configuration manager acts as a connector because the manager facilitates for managing the application data specified by the content descriptor file and the capability matching component acts on matching application data with mobile devices based on functionality.

In response to the applicant's argument that Tautini fails to teach or suggest accessing a location of said function based on access information relating to the location described in information contained by said existing connector:

Par [0130], lines 1-14 of Tautini discloses a transport connector, an indicator (i.e. path name locator) for a group of software, and an access interface. In this instance, the transport connector provides a translator including functionality data for shared services. In light of Tautini, the limitation "accessing information relating to the location" correlates to the pathname locator, used for software group indication (which one of ordinary skill in the art would find synonymous with locating the software function), disclosed within par [0130], lines 12-14 of Tautini and the disclosed function information group, disclosed in lines 1-5 of Tautini, includes a transport connector that is utilized regarding processing messages relating to functions of particular services and function information group data; as shown in par [0130] of Tautini, lines 1-10 and correlated to information contained by the existing connector because the transport connector is already embedded within the function information group for displaying software function related data.

In response to the applicant's argument that Gibbons and Tautini fail to teach or suggest an external function management unit responsive to the location of the required function being determined by the connector management unit to be an external location to the service utilization terminal to provide the required function from the external location so that the required function from the external location can be utilized:

Par [0117-0118] of Tautini discloses shared service registration for an access interface interface (function management unit) that provides stored access information regarding internal and external shared services. In this instance, the messaging component (connector management unit) disclosed in par [0116] of Tautini, facilitates for information transfer of required service components and coordinated with the access interface for providing information on accessing functionality of shared services (as shown in par [0118] of Tautini), which one of ordinary skill in the art would find synonymous with providing a required function in order to run specific application data.

In response to the applicant's argument that Mitchell fails to teach or suggest a connector management unit for providing access to the required existing connector from a holding location in a different device by accessing said holding location in a different device:

Par [0021], lines 25-40 of Mitchell, discloses allowing access of data stored information via a plurality of client devices using connectors in a multiple client platform. Par [0022], of Mitchell, lines 1-20 discloses a universal connector system that allows for discovery and linking client devices with PIM applications and data types. In this instance one of the plurality of client devices would have to contain the ability to access connectors/application function information regarding another application because the device would need compatibility information in order to sync with a compatible device's PIM software in order to connect.